

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. The Applicant has carefully considered the official communication dated July 22, 2004. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendment and the following remarks are fully responsive to the official communication.
2. The claims have been amended in light of the official communication. It is submitted that no new matter has been added as a result of the amendment.
3. The Examiner has objected to the claims on the grounds of a number of informalities. The claims have been amended to address these informalities.
4. In paragraph 6, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-2, 4-5, 7, 10-15, 18, 26, 30-34, 37, 45, 56 & 61 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Filion in view of Zingher.
5. Claims 12 to 14 have been cancelled. Claim 30 has been cancelled. Claim 56 has been cancelled.
6. Claim 1 has been amended to emphasize the fact that the identifiers are printed with invisible ink that is capable of being read by a reader of the interface module. Claims 61, 2, 4, 5, 7, 11, 15, and 18, as amended, are all dependent ultimately on claim 1. Claim 26 has been similarly amended. Claim 31 has been similarly amended. Claims 32, 33, 34, 37 and 45, as amended, are all ultimately dependent on claim 31. It follows that the remarks made in connection with claim 1 are apposite for the remaining claims.
7. In paragraph 6, the Examiner has stated that Filion discloses an interface module "including a reader that is capable of reading the, or each, identifier to generate a request for the second information such that the printer generates a second ...". However, with respect to claim 1, as amended, it is respectfully submitted that Filion does not disclose a reader that is capable of reading invisible ink. Rather, Filion discloses a scanner (column 8, lines 4 to 10) for reading an image on a document. There is nothing disclosed in Filion that indicates that the scanner is capable of reading invisible ink.
8. The Examiner has stated that Zingher in Figure 1, column 2, lines 5 to 25 and column 4, lines 5 to 30 and in the whole document, describes "a calculation means that is connectable to the network and is responsive to the module for determining a payment to be made by a second party controlling the second data storage means to a first party controlling the first data storage means." With respect, it is submitted that this is not described either in the particular text indicated by the Examiner or anywhere else in the document.
9. The Examiner has continued to state that it would have been obvious to combine the teachings since such a combination would have provided a system as described in column 6, lines 48 to 67 of Filion. With respect, Filion already provides the means as described in that passage. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination should lead to the invention of the present application and not one of the citations. In this regard, the Examiner is respectfully reminded of the provisions of *Hodosh v Block Drug Co. Inc.*, 786 F.2d 1136, 1143 n.5, 229 USPQ 182, 187 n.5 (Fed Cir. 1986) in which it was held that when applying 35 USC 103, the following tenets of patent law must be adhered to:

- (a) The claimed invention must be considered as a whole;

- (b) The references must be considered as a whole and must suggest the desirability and thus the obviousness of making the combination;
- (c) The references must be viewed without the benefit of impermissible hindsight vision afforded by the claimed invention; and
- (d) Reasonable expectation of success is the standard with which obviousness is determined.

10. It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner has not made out an argument that Filion and Zingher suggest the desirability and thus the obviousness of combining Filion and Zingher. Furthermore, it is respectfully submitted that any combination of these citations must have been made with hindsight, which is impermissible.

11. In spite of the Applicant's submission that the Examiner has not made out the necessary argument, Applicants has introduced the limitation of printing the identifier with invisible ink for the purposes of clarity of definition and not as an admission that the claims, prior to this amendment are obvious in the light of the cited documentation.

12. The Examiner has rejected the further independent claims 26, 31 and 56 on the same grounds. Accordingly the above remarks apply to that rejection.

13. In view of the Applicant's submission that the independent claims, as amended, are not obvious in the light of the cited documents, the Applicant has traversed the rejection of the dependent claims. It is thus not necessary to consider the Examiner's rejection of the dependent claims.

14. Page of the specification has been updated to replace application numbers with granted patent numbers where applicable. The Applicants submits that these amendments do not introduce any new matter.

It is respectfully submitted that all of the Examiner's objections have been successfully traversed. Accordingly, it is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance of the application are courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,
Applicants:



KIA SILVERBROOK



PAUL LAPSTUN

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762